

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Phillip M. Bedford,
Plaintiff,
v.
City of Hayward, et al.,
Defendant.

Case No.: [3:12-cv-00294-JCS](#)

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
DENYING IN PART JOINT LETTER
MOTION TO COMPEL [Docket No. 41]**

The parties submitted a joint letter dated August 7, 2012. Good cause appearing, the Court Orders as follows:

1. The motion to compel a further response to Plaintiff's Interrogatory No. 1 is **DENIED**. The responsive documents are sufficiently described.
2. The motion to compel a further response to Plaintiff's Interrogatory No. 3 is **GRANTED** subject to the entry of an appropriate confidentiality protective order. The parties are directed to submit a joint proposed protective order within seven (7) days of this Order.
3. The motion to compel a further response to Plaintiff's Interrogatories Nos. 4, 6, 8, 9, and 10 is **DENIED** without prejudice. These interrogatories are in the nature of contention interrogatories, which are appropriate only at the close of discovery.
4. The motion to compel a further response to Plaintiff's Interrogatory No. 7 is **GRANTED**.
5. The motion to compel a further response to Plaintiff's Interrogatories Nos. 11-17 is **DENIED**. These interrogatories are substantially overbroad -- nearly all of the information that would be responsive to these interrogatories would be completely

1 irrelevant to this case. Plaintiff may propound narrowly crafted interrogatories on these
2 subjects.

- 3 6. The request to stay discovery in **DENIED**. Additional responses required by this
4 Order shall be provided within thirty (30) days.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6
7 Dated: August 21, 2012

8
9 
10 _____
11 Joseph C. Spero
12 United States Magistrate Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court
Northern District of California